



**BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**  
**DELEGATED DECISION REPORT**

<b>Application No:</b>	17/14741/FUL	<b>Case Officer:</b>	Mrs Kate Edwards
<b>Site Notice Posted:</b>	4th May 2017	<b>Consultation Date:</b>	10th Apr 2017
<b>Date Valid:</b>	6th Apr 2017	<b>8 Week Target:</b>	1st Jun 2017
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Delegated Decision		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of dwelling		
<b>Address:</b>	Norcott , Common Road, Gilwern		

**CONSULTATIONS/COMMENTS**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Received</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Llanelly Community Council	11th May 2017	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Llanelly Community Council regarding the above planning application. This application was presented to members of the community council on the 8 May, and it was resolved that a site meeting should be convened to consider the primary concern relating to the overbearing and the impact on neighbouring properties. The community council would ask for a deferral until 16 May, this will enable elected members to consider the proposed application.</p>
Monmouthshire County Council Highways	16th May 2017	<p>No objection (subject to any specified conditions below)</p> <p><b>OBSERVATIONS / COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The application is for the construction of a new residential dwelling and associated vehicular access, garage and parking and turning area within the grounds of</p>

Norcott, Common Road Gilwern.

Common Road is a thoroughfare bounded by a series of residential properties on both sides which is not dissimilar to a typical residential estate road with individual vehicular access points to each property.

As part of the proposed development it is proposed to create a new vehicular access, garage and parking and turning area directly onto Common Road in the same form as existing residential properties. Visibility from the proposed access is more than adequate and exceeds the requirements as set out in Manual for Streets and the proposed parking provision is satisfactory and in accordance with the requirements set out in the Monmouthshire Parking Standards.

In light of the aforementioned comments it is considered that the level of traffic generated from the proposed development will have negligible impact on the local highway network therefore there are no highway grounds to sustain an objection to the application, subject to the following conditions being applied to any grant of planning approval:-

1. The access shall be of a hard surface material for a minimum distance of 5m from the edge of carriageway so as to prevent any loose material being brought out onto the highway.
2. Surface water shall be disposed of on-site through a sustainable means and shall not be drained onto the adjacent public highway.
3. The car parking provision proposed shall be retained in perpetuity.

#### NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. It should be brought to the attention of the applicant that in the event of a new or altered vehicular access being formed, the requirements of Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 must be acknowledged and satisfied. In this respect the applicant shall apply for permission pursuant to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 prior to commencement of access works via MCC Highways.

Health And Safety Executive	10th Apr 2017	HSE does not have an interest in the development
Linesearch	10th Apr 2017	Western Power may have an interest.

The development plan for the area is the Brecon Beacons National Park Local Development Plan 2007-2022 (hereafter LDP) which was adopted by resolution of the National Park Authority on the 17th December 2013.

My observations relate to the proposals compliance with the strategy and policy of the LDP.

#### Proposal

The application is a full application for the provision of a single dwelling in Gilwern.

#### LDP Policy Context

The proposal is located within the settlement boundary for the Settlement of Gilwern as shown on the LDP Proposals Map which is a suitable location to accommodate small scale development. Criterion 1 of Policy S LP2 enables proposals which strengthen and enhance the mix of dwelling types and tenure options within the settlement.

As such, the principle of this development is sound, subject to the following policy considerations.

#### Affordable Housing Contribution

All proposals which result in the net creation of dwellings will be required to make a contribution towards affordable housing. This is implemented through Policy 28 of the LDP which sets out that the contribution will either be through on site provision, a commuted sum, or a mix of both mechanisms. The implementation of this policy is supplemented by the Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2014 (hereafter SPG).

Gilwern lies within the Abergavenny, Hay on Wye and Crickhowell Submarket area. Within this area the level of contribution is 30% of the total development.

In accordance with Step 2 of the pre-application process set out in the SPG where the contribution towards affordable housing equates to a fraction of a whole unit, the contribution will be made through the payment of a commuted sum to the National Park Authority. This contribution will be used to fund affordable housing schemes within the National Park area. As this proposal is for 1 dwelling it is considered that onsite provision is not feasible as such to meet the requirements of Policy 28 the proposal will be subject to a financial contribution towards affordable housing.

Appendix 5 of the draft SPG sets out the formula for the calculation of the commuted sum thus.

Committed sums are calculated on the basis of a percentage of Welsh Government Acceptable costs Guidance (ACG). ACG issued by the Welsh Government is a recognised measure of the cost of providing affordable housing in different communities in Wales.

Therefore the calculation of committed sums is based on the principle of equating the developer contribution with the accepted Welsh Government Grant level of 58% of the ACG.

The formula for the calculation for the calculation of the committed sum will therefore be:

Committed sum Contribution = A x B x C

Where:

A= number of units

B= 58% of ACG (for relevant property type and band area)

C= % of relevant submarket area

For the above proposal, the following applies:

A= 1 unit

B= Gilwern is located within ACG Band 3. A 7 person, 4 bedroom house within Band 3 has an ACG of £206,400. 58% of ACG equates to £119,712

C= 30% total contribution

As such the calculation is as follows  $1 \times 119,712 \times 0.3 = £35,913$

This contribution must be agreed by S106 on the grant of planning permission. Failure to do without agreement by the NPA will result in the proposal failing the requirements of LDP Policy 28 and the strategy and policy team would uphold an objection to the proposal.

In accordance with appendix 4 of the draft SPG if it can be reasonably demonstrated in writing by the applicant to the satisfaction of the NPA that there are significant factors which mean that the scheme is unviable at the target affordable housing contribution as set out in Policy

28, the NPA will seek to verify this using the 3 Dragons Development Appraisal Toolkit (or equivalent process) with a final recourse to the District Valuer. Disputes of viability referred to the District Valuer will be charged at cost to the Developer. Affordable Housing will still be required at a level proven to be viable through the above verification process.

In your consideration of the application I trust you will give due regard to criterion i) of Policy 1: Appropriate Development in the National Park.

#### Recommendation

In order for the proposal to demonstrate compliance with the policy of the LDP the following issue must be addressed by the applicant:

1. Provide detail of the contribution the scheme will make towards affordable housing in line with the requirements of Policy 28 as set out above.

As always if you have any concerns relating to the contents of my observations, or require additional clarification of any point please do not hesitate to get in contact.

As always if you have any concerns relating to the contents of my observations, or require additional clarification of any point please do not hesitate to get in contact.

## **CONTRIBUTORS**

Anthony Godfrey, Glenview, Common Road  
Mr Andrew Baker, 8 Glanmoor, Gilwern

## **NEIGHBOUR/THIRD PARTY RESPONSE SUMMARY**

No objections to the infilling of the plot  
The proposed building does not respect the existing building lines.  
The rear of the property would be overlooked  
The conservatory and garden will be over shadowed and will lead to loss of sunlight  
The proposed dwelling is, in comparison to nearby dwellings, too large.  
Questions if there is adequate water supply/water pressure.  
Trees might be affected by the development.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

## Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016

### Local Development Plan

Policy 1 Appropriate Development in the National Park  
Policy 8 Trees and Development  
Policy 28 Affordable Housing Contributions and Supplementary Planning Guidance adopted  
September 2014  
Policy 59 Impacts of Traffic  
Policy 61 Dwelling Density

### PLANNING HISTORY

App Ref	Description	Decision	Date
---------	-------------	----------	------

### OFFICER'S REPORT

#### Introduction

The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Gilwern. The plot measures an area some 0.08 hectares and is located between two residential dwellings. The dwelling to the north of the site is a traditional two storey building which has been extended to the rear. The building to the south of the site is a hip roofed bungalow. The two storey and single storey nature of the adjacent properties are typical of the area.

#### Proposed Development

The proposed three storey dwelling will be set back from the front of the site by some 11 m. In front of the principle elevation of the dwelling will be parking, turning and a double garage.

The design of the dwelling includes front and rear gables. The rear gable will be positioned centrally and flush with the elevation. The front gable, will be located towards the northern side of the principle elevation and project by some 2.3 m.

The dwelling will measure some 14.5 m wide, 12.0 m deep (plus an additional 2.3 m of the front gable), 4.3 m to eaves level and 9.0 m to ridge height. The roof will measure some 4.7 m in height.

The garage will measure some 6.3 m wide, 6.5 m deep, 2.5 m to eaves level and 5.2 m to ridge height.

The external materials are rendered elevations, natural slate roof and window frames and doors will be uPVC or timber.

The parking and turning area will be tarmac and a SUDs will be provided.

Hedgerow will be provided along the north, south and west boundaries, and trees planted at the front of the site.

## Principle of Development

The proposal is located within the settlement boundary of Gilwern, which is a suitable location to accommodate small scale development. Criterion 1 of Policy S LP2 enables proposals which strengthen and enhance the mix of dwelling types and tenure options within the settlement.

All proposals which result in the net creation of dwellings will be required to make a contribution towards affordable housing. This is implemented through Policy 28 of the Local Development Plan which sets out that the contribution will either be through on site provision, a commuted sum, or a mix of both mechanisms. The implementation of this policy is supplemented by the Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2014.

The comments of the Policy and Strategy Team are provided above. In summary the Team considers the principle of development is acceptable. However it is noted that no information has been submitted in respect of an affordable housing contribution. As such, the Team have requested that detail regarding the contribution is sought.

Officers have serious concerns regarding the design and impact of the proposed dwelling. For these reasons have not sought any detail regarding the contribution, as to do so would be unreasonable in this instance.

In summary it is considered that the principle of development meets with the requirements of Policy S LP2 Settlements Appropriate Development. However, the development does not meet with the requirements of Policy 28 Affordable Housing Contributions as no agreement regarding the payment of an affordable housing contribution has been achieved.

## Visual Impact

Policy 1 (Appropriate Development in the National Park) states that:

All proposals for development or change of use of land or buildings in the National Park must comply with the following criteria, where they are relevant to the proposal:

- i) the scale, form, design, layout, density, intensity of use and use of materials will be appropriate to the surroundings and will maintain or enhance the quality and character of the Park's Natural Beauty, wildlife, cultural heritage and built environment;
- ii) the proposed development is integrated into the landscape to the satisfaction of the NPA through planting and appropriate management of native species or through the construction of appropriate boundary features;

Common Road is a residential through road with dwellings of mixed character to both sides. There is no particular rhythm to the appearance of the dwellings, but they are generally set back from the roadside behind front gardens, with some variation to their depths. The dwellings in the vicinity of the site are modest in scale and character and to the south of the site are bungalows. As a consequence, the dwellings do not generally appear dominant in the street scene. Details submitted on the site layout plan indicate that the finished floor level of the dwelling would be some 0.54 m lower than that of the adjacent bungalow. The ridge height of the proposed development would be, taking into account the slope of the land, some 3.5 m higher than, Norcott, the bungalow that is directly adjacent to the site and 2.0 m higher than the next (Llanerch). The height and scale of the building is considered to result in a dominant and visually intrusive form of development. Further to this the protrusion of the front gable and large roof will exacerbate the domination of the proposed dwelling when approaching the site from the south and viewing the property from the east.

In respect of views from the north, officers note that Glen View directly to the north of the application property is two storey. The ridge height of this property is approximately 6 m and due to sloping nature of the site Glen View is lower. Whilst the submitted site layout plan does not include the finished floor level of Glen View, it is considered the proposed dwelling would be some 3.0 m greater in height. Again the protrusion of the front gable will exacerbate the domination of the proposed dwelling when approaching the site from the north. The dwellings to the north of Glen View are bungalows and would do nothing to assist in the incorporation of the dwelling into the street scene.

In comparing the proposed development with those on the opposite side of the street officer's note that the majority are two storey. Many are Local Housing Authority properties built in the 1950s and 1960s. The character and appearance of the properties are simple. The ridge height of the nearest of these properties is approximately 8.5 m. The rear elevation of the property opposite the site is clearly seen in the street and the property is some 6.7 m in height. As such the proposed dwelling would be greater in height than the dwellings opposite.

In respect of building lines: It is noted that the position of the proposed dwelling is between the building line established by Glen View and Norcott. As such it is considered that, notwithstanding the concerns regarding the scale, mass and design, the building line of the dwelling would be acceptable.

It is noted that the garage has been placed with connectivity with the parking and turning area. However, the proposed garage would result in a large ancillary building being directly adjacent to the primary boundary of the site and the building is proud of the building lines established by the neighbouring dwellings. Its proximity to the street frontage and scale of the garage would result in a prominent addition to the street scene not seen elsewhere in the locality. Whilst there may be some argument that the building line is not so affected by an ancillary building, the position some 20 cm to 50 cm from the boundary is inappropriate.

Consideration was given to requesting revised plans, however it is considered that the development would require significant redesign to be rendered acceptable.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of policy I criterion i) as the scale, form, mass and design is disproportionately large in comparison to neighbouring properties and would not maintain or enhance the quality and character of the Park's Natural built environment.

It is considered that the proposed garage fails to meet with the requirements of policy I criterion i). Although not unacceptable in size is, being adjacent to the principle boundary of the site, inappropriately located and would result in an incongruous feature in the street scene and would not maintain or enhance the quality and character of the Park's Natural built environment.

## Density

Policy 61 of the LDP requires that all proposals are developed at 30dph unless this would be incompatible with the character of the surrounding area.

The character of the area is such that houses on the west side of the public highway, the side of road the proposed dwelling will be located, are at a density of approximately 0.08 ha per dwelling. It is noted that the proposed dwelling is on a plot measuring some 0.08 ha. As such it is considered that, due to the character of the surrounding area the density is acceptable.



It is considered that the development meets with the requirements of the above policy.

#### Residential Amenities

Welsh Government Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016 requires that the impact of development on residential space is a material planning consideration.

Officers note that Glen View has the benefit of a large garden and that the site is located in an urban area where dwellings are in close proximity. However, given the north gable of the proposed dwelling will be some 12 m in depth and 9 m in height, and 1.3 m from the boundary with Glen View there are serious concerns regarding over bearing impact.

In terms of loss of light there is some merit in the objection of the third party. It is noted that the proposed dwelling will be to the south of Glen View. As such, due to the scale and mass of the proposed dwelling, it may cause some detriment in terms of loss of light. During the site visit it was noted that there was a rear conservatory to the neighbouring property which it is considered would potentially be impacted by the proposal. This was not shown in the layout plan submitted with the application. No evidence or information has been submitted with the planning application to assess potential loss of light and an officer's assessment was made through the site visit where the close proximity of the neighbouring property and the scale of the proposal was considered to give rise to significant concern that the proposal would substantially impact on the light reaching the neighbouring property. Further information could be submitted to assess the likely impact on the neighbouring property, however due to the concerns regarding visual impact, to do so would be unreasonable.

Turning to potential impact on, Norcott, the bungalow to the south. Officers note that the south gable of the dwelling will be some 2.3 m from the boundary of the site and then the drive way is positioned between the boundary of the site and Norcott. In addition the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling is in line with the rear elevation of Norcott. As such it is considered that there would not be any significant overbearing as the proposed dwelling would be better aligned with and more distant from this property and less likely to result in a significant amenity impact.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016 as the location, scale, form and mass of the proposed dwelling would be detrimental to the occupants of Glen View and result in development that is overbearing.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016. Without evidence regarding potential loss of light, the proposed dwelling is considered likely to have an unacceptable impact on the occupants of Glen View as a result of loss of light.

#### Impact on Trees

Policy 8 Trees and Development requires that proposals for development on sites containing trees will be required to provide a tree survey and tree protection plan in support of the proposal.

It is noted that there are a number of trees that are located close to the application site and the boundary with Glen View. No information has been submitted regarding impact on these trees or protection measures. It is noted that the plans illustrate that hedgerow will, other than the principle boundary, be planted around the site boundary. The provision of such a planting scheme indicates that biodiversity and softening of the site boundary is part of the proposed development. However, there

remain significant trees on the boundary and the scope for their protection and retention should be considered through appropriate arboricultural assessments.

As such it is considered that, without a Tree Survey, the proposed development fails to meet with the requirements of Policy 8 Trees and Development.

#### Highway Safety

Policy 59 requires that there are no unacceptable impacts on highway safety as a result of volume or movements on to the public highway.

The comments of the Local Highway Authority are provided above. The Local Highway Authority considers that proposed development is acceptable and would not result in a detriment to highway safety. A number of conditions regarding materials, surface water disposal and parking provision were recommended.

It is considered that the proposed development meets with the requirements of the above policy.

#### Conclusion

It is considered that the principle of development is acceptable. However the scale, mass, form and design of the proposed dwelling is considered unacceptable and would detrimental visual impact on the street scene. The location of the proposed garage, with the side elevation of the structure directly adjacent to the principle boundary is unacceptable and would cause a detrimental visual impact on the street scene.

The proposed dwelling would, due to its size, mass and location adjacent to the boundary of Glen View, represent development that is overbearing and, therefore, to the detriment of the occupiers of Glen View.

There is a lack of evidence to prove that, due to the close relationship between the proposed dwelling and Glen View there is no unacceptable loss of light. There is a lack of information regarding the potential impact on trees adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. No agreement has been made regarding the affordable housing contribution.

There are no issues regarding highway safety.

It is considered that the proposed development should be refused for the following reasons:

#### **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

##### **Reasons:**

- 1 The scale, form, mass and design of the proposed dwelling is disproportionately large in comparison to neighbouring properties and would not maintain or enhance the quality and character of the Park's Natural built environment. The proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of Brecon Beacons National Park Authority Local Development Plan Policy 1 criterion i).
- 2 The proposed garage is inappropriately located and would result in an incongruous feature in the street scene, it would not maintain or enhance the quality and character of the National Park's built environment. It is considered that the proposed garage fails to meet with the

requirements of Brecon Beacons National Park Authority Local Development Plan Policy 1 criterion i).

- 3 The location, scale, form and mass of the proposed dwelling would be detrimental to the occupants of Glen View and result in development that is overbearing. The proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016.
- 4 Without a Tree Survey the potential impact on trees cannot be established. It is considered that the proposed garage fails to meet with the requirements of Brecon Beacons National Park Authority Local Development Plan Policy 8.
- 5 The siting, scale and massing of the proposed dwelling are considered likely to result in a reduction in the light reaching the rear elevation of the adjoining property known as Glen View. Insufficient information is available to assess the potential impact of the development on Glen View and an assessment that there is likely to be an unacceptable impact has been reached based on the submitted plans and a site visit. The proposed dwelling fails to meet with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 12: Design March 2016.
- 6 No mechanism is available to provide an affordable housing contribution. The development does not meet with the requirements of Brecon Beacons National Park Authority Local Development Plan policy 28 Affordable Housing Contributions and Supplementary Planning Guidance adopted September 2014.

**Signed (Case Officer):**  
Mrs Kate Edwards  
Senior Planning Officer (DC)



31/05/17

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Checked (Principal Planner):**



Date: 31/05/2017

**Signed (National Park  
Authorised Officer):**



Date: 1/06/2017

